



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/072,376	02/06/2002	Chris J. Wendel	077077-9140-00	2563

7590 10/24/2003

David B. Smith  
Michael Best & Friedrich LLP  
100 East Wisconsin Avenue  
Milwaukee, WI 53202-4108

EXAMINER
----------

SAFAIPOUR, HOUSHANG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2622

DATE MAILED: 10/24/2003

2

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/072,376

Applicant(s)

WENDEL, CHRIS J.

Examiner

Houshang Safaipoor

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 06 February 2002 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 12, 14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sikes et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,018,213) and further in view of Bloemendaal et al. (U. S. Patent No. 4,225,923).

Regarding claim 1, Sikes et al. discloses a camera assembly for use in scanning a paper substrate of a printing press, said assembly comprising:

a housing (fig. 1);

camera mounted within said housing (fig. 3, camera 116);

a light source mounted within said housing (Fig. 3, light source 112); and

Sikes et al does not explicitly disclose two mirrors positioned within said housing to direct light in two distinct paths from said light source to the paper substrate. Bloemendaal et al. discloses such an apparatus (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sikes apparatus with that of Bloemendaal because with the addition of the mirrors and lens uniform light would be directed towards the substrate.

Regarding claim 2, sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said camera is a CCD type Camera (col. 1, lines 52-68).

Regarding claim 3, Sikes et al. discloses the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein said light source is a strobe type light source (fig. 3, strobe light 112).

Regarding claim 4, Sikes et al does not explicitly disclose the camera assembly of claim 1 wherein at least one of said mirrors is flat. Bloemendaal et al. discloses such an apparatus (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sikes apparatus with that of Bloemendaal because with the addition of the mirrors and lens uniform light would be directed towards the substrate.

Regarding claim 5, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 4 are applicable to claim 5.

Regarding claims 7, 14 and 18, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 3 are applicable to claim 7, 14 and 18.

Regarding claim 12, Sikes et al. discloses a lighting assembly for a camera positioned adjacent a paper substrate of a printing press, said assembly comprising:

a strobe light source (fig. 3, strobe light 112); and

Sikes et al does not explicitly disclose two mirrors positioned within said housing to direct light in two distinct paths from said light source to the paper substrate. Bloemendaal et al. discloses such an apparatus (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Sikes apparatus with that of Bloemendaal because with the addition of the mirrors and lens uniform light would be directed towards the substrate.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6, 8-11, 13, 15-17, 19 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bloemendaal et al. (U. S. Patent No. 4,225,923).

Regarding claim 6, bloemendaal et al. discloses a lighting assembly for lighting a paper substrate of a printing press, said assembly comprising:

a light source (fig. 1, light source 9); and

at least one mirror positioned adjacent said light source to direct light from said light source to the paper substrate (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13).

Regarding claim 8, Bloemendaal et al. discloses the lighting assembly of claim 7 wherein said strobe type light source is a Xenon strobe bulb 9col. 3, lines 54-58).

Regarding claim 9, Bloemendaal et al. discloses the lighting assembly of claim 6 wherein said at least one mirror is flat (fig. 1, mirror 12).

Regarding claim 10, Bloemendaal et al. discloses the lighting assembly of claim 6 wherein said at least one mirror is two mirrors (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13).

Regarding claim 11, Bloemendaal et al. discloses the lighting assembly of claim 10 wherein said mirrors are positioned within said assembly to direct light from two different directions from the light source to the paper substrate (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13).

Regarding claim 13, Bloemendaal et al. discloses a method of creating a dual light paths directed toward a paper substrate of a printing press, said method comprising:

supplying a light source (fig. 1, light source 9);

supplying two mirrors (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13); and

positioning said mirrors adjacent said light source such that light from said light source strikes said mirrors and light is redirected in a dual light paths toward the paper substrate (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13).

Regarding claim 15, Bloemendaal et al. discloses the method of claim 13 wherein said mirrors are flat (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13).

Regarding claim 16, Bloemendaal et al. discloses the method of claim 13 wherein each light path has an illumination intensity that is substantially the same (fig. 1).

Regarding claim 17, arguments analogous to those presented for claim 13 are applicable to claim 17.

Regarding claim 19, Bloemendaal et al. discloses the method of claim 17 wherein said at least two mirrors is two mirrors (fig. 1, mirrors 12 and 13).

Regarding claim 20, Bloemendaal et al. discloses the method of claim 17 wherein at least one of said at least two mirrors is flat (fig. 1, mirrors 12).


### ***Conclusion***


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Houshang Safaipoor whose telephone number is (703)306-4037. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 6:30am to 5:00pm.

Art Unit: 2622

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edward L Coles, Sr. can be reached on (703)305-4712. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)306-0377.

 Houshang Safaipoor  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2622  
October 3, 2003

  
EDWARD COLES  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600